UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/672,935 | 09/28/2000 | Kevin A. Retlich | 00AB191 | 7591 |

7590 05/03/2007

Allen-Bradley Company LLC
Attention John J Horn
Patent Dept 704P Floor 8 T-29
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| STORK, KYLE R | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2178 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 05/03/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/672,935 | RETLICH, KEVIN A. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Kyle R. Stork | 2178 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 March 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 23 March 2007.

2. Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 9, and 20 are independent claims.

The objection to claims 5 and 17 has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tkacs et al (US 5526268, filed 11 May 1994, hereafter Tkacs) and further in view of Bapat (US 4916610, filed 5 October 1988), and further in view of the applicant's admitted prior art (Specification, pages 1-2, hereafter Specification).

As per independent claim 1, Tkacs discloses:

a database including component data descriptive of the components and a plurality of language fields including textual labels for component data presentations and a plurality of language fields including textual labels for component data presentations translated into a plurality of languages (column 4, lines 10- column 5, line 19; column 6, lines 12-17 and 34-39)

a plurality of monitoring screens viewable on the monitoring station and including representations of component designations and component status parameters based upon monitored data collected via the data network from the components in which identifying component data is stored by the monitoring system (column 7, lines 17-38; column 11, lines 45-49)

wherein the monitoring station is configured to access textual labels in a desired language from the database for displaying the monitoring screens (column 6, lines 34-39; column 7, lines 28-38; column 11, lines 5-7; column 14, lines 25-27)

Tkacs further discloses a real-time monitoring and display system (column 6, lines 14-29).

Tkacs fails to specifically disclose use of language fields. However, Bapat discloses fields containing allocated storage (column 6, line 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Bapat with Tkacs, since it would have allowed a user to allocate fields for storing data.

Tkacs fails to specifically disclose collecting data from the components in which the data is stored. However, Specification discloses "components which regulate the application of electrical power to load (page 1, lines 13-14)." Further, industrial processes containing these components, "may rely upon sensed parameters (page 1, lines 17-18)." Since the parameters are sensed from the components, the components inherently store data and transmit the data through the network. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have

combined Specification with Tkacs, since it would have allowed a user to obtain component data via a data network.

As per dependent claim 2, Tkacs further discloses wherein at least one monitoring screen includes a user viewable menu for selecting the desired language (column 10, line 46- column 11, line 9).

As per dependent claim 3, Tkacs further discloses wherein the monitoring system is configured to change textual labels in respective monitoring screens upon a change by a user of the desired language without otherwise altering the monitoring screen (column 10, line 50- column 11, line 9; column 3, lines 36-41).

As per dependent claim 4, Tkacs further discloses wherein the component data in the database includes component parameter settings (column 7, lines 28-38).

As per dependent claim 5, Tkacs further discloses wherein the component data in the database includes historical event data the each component (column 8, lines 44-46).

As per dependent claim 6, Tkacs further discloses wherein the component data in the database includes textual data descriptive of each component, and wherein the textual data is translated into the desired language for display (column 10, line 24-column 11, line 5).

As per dependent claim 7, Tkacs further discloses wherein the component data in the database includes data representative of an image of each component (column 6, lines 22-26).

5. Claim 8 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tkacs, Bapat, and Specification, and further in view of Bargh et al. (US 6212491, filed 9 November 1998, hereafter Bargh).

As per dependent claim 8, Tkacs, Bapat, and Specification disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Tkacs further discloses wherein the monitoring system is configured for the component status parameters and to display the updated status parameter representations with currently selected desired language (column 6, lines 34-39).

Tkacs fails to specifically disclose automatically polling the components for the component status parameter. However, Bargh discloses polling a facility within a simulation model for results rather than running an actual simulation (column 21, lines 38-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Bargh with Tkacs, since it would have allowed a user to perform high performance simulations.

6. Claims 9-20 and 22-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tkacs and further in view of Specification.

As per independent claim 9, Tkacs discloses:

a database including component data descriptive of the components and a plurality of language fields including textual labels for component data presentations translated into a plurality of languages (column 4, lines 10- column 5, line 19; column 6, lines 12-17 and 34-39)

a plurality of monitoring screens viewable on the monitoring station and including representations of component destinations and component status parameters based upon monitored data collected by the monitoring station via the data network (column 7, lines 17-38; column 11, lines 45-49)

wherein the monitoring station is configured to access textual labels in a desired language from the database for displaying the monitoring screens (column 6, lines 34-39; column 7, lines 28-38; column 11, lines 5-7; column 14, lines 25-27)

Tkacs fails to specifically disclose collecting data from the components in which the data is stored. However, Specification discloses "components which regulate the application of electrical power to load (page 1, lines 13-14)." Further, industrial processes containing these components, "may rely upon sensed parameters (page 1, lines 17-18)." Since the parameters are sensed from the components, the components inherently store data and transmit the data through the network. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Specification with Tkacs, since it would have allowed a user to obtain component data via a data network.

As per dependent claim 10, Tkacs further discloses wherein the database is stored at the monitoring station (column 6, line 60- column 7, line 38).

As per dependent claim 11, Tkacs further discloses wherein the monitoring representations include a user viewable menu of selectable languages (column 7, lines 28-38; column 11, lines 12-17).

As per dependent claim 12, Tkacs further discloses wherein the monitoring station is configured to access the desired language for the textual labels from the database based upon a user selection made via the menu (column 10, line 46- column 11, line 9).

As per dependent claim 13, Tkacs discloses wherein the parameters are updated in real-time column 6, lines 14-29).

As per dependent claim 14, Tkacs discloses wherein the desired language may be selectively changed by a user in real-time without otherwise altering display of updated component status parameters (column 3, lines 36-41; column 12, lines 56-60).

As per dependent claim 15, Tkacs further discloses wherein the components are configured to store component designation data and to transmit the designation data to the monitoring system upon demand by the monitoring system (column 7, lines 28-38).

As per dependent claims 16-19, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claims 4-7 respectively. Claims 16-19 are similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 20, Tkacs discloses:

accessing component status data from a plurality of electrical components of a control and monitory system via a data network (column 1, lines 29-34; column 6, line 14- column 7, line 38)

accessing textual labels corresponding to the component status data from a system database, the database including translations of the textual labels in a plurality of languages and component descriptions for the components (column 4, line 10- column 5, line 19; column 6, lines 34-63)

displaying a plurality of monitoring representations for the component including presentations of component status data and textual labels in a desired language of the plurality of languages accessed from the database (column 6, line 34- column 7, line 38)

Tkacs fails to specifically disclose collecting data from the components in which the data is stored. However, Specification discloses "components which regulate the application of electrical power to load (page 1, lines 13-14)." Further, industrial processes containing these components, "may rely upon sensed parameters (page 1, lines 17-18)." Since the parameters are sensed from the components, the components inherently store data and transmit the data through the network. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Specification with Tkacs, since it would have allowed a user to obtain component data via a data network.

As per dependent claims 22, Tkacs further discloses wherein the textual labels are accessed from the database in accordance with predetermined fields of the representations (column 6, lines 34-63; column 10, lines 46-48).

As per dependent claim 23, Tkacs further discloses wherein the textual labels are accessed from the database in accordance with a user selection of the desired language (column 11, lines 5-9).

As per dependent claim 24, Tkacs further discloses wherein the representations include a user viewable menu for selecting the desired language (column 10, line 46- column 11, line 9).

As per dependent claim 25, Tkacs discloses wherein the desire language can be changed in real-time by a user selection via the menu (column 10, lines 46-48).

As per dependent claim 26, Tkacs discloses wherein the component descriptions are displayed in the monitoring representations for the respective components (column 7, lines 28-38; column 8, lines 44-46).

As per dependent claim 27, Tkacs discloses wherein the component descriptions are stored in the database in the plurality of languages (column 1, lines 12-17; column 6, line 60-63).

As per dependent claim 28, Tkacs discloses wherein the component descriptions are displayed in the monitoring representations in the desired languages (column 7, lines 28-38; column 11, lines 5-7).

7. Claim 21 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tkacs and Specification, and further in view of Bargh.

As per dependent claim 21, Tkacs and Specification disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 20, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Tkacs fails to specifically disclose the use of polling. However, Bargh discloses polling (column 21, lines 38-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Bargh with Tkacs, since it would have allowed a user to receive status information.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 23 March 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the specification fails to teach sensing operating parameters from control components (page 12). However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant's remarks state, "a relay may be mechanically configured to sense the current passing to a motor from a power source through a conductor, and to disconnect the motor from the power source if the current exceeds a certain threshold (page 12)." It appears that the sensing of the current (operating parameter) causing the disconnect of the motor meets the applicant's limitation of sensing operating parameters from control components.

The applicant further argues that no component data is stored within the components (page 12). Again, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The components are inherently in one of two states, either within a desired range or outside a desired range. If the component values are within a desired range, the system performs as intended, while if the component values are outside a desired range, a disconnect may occur. The system, based upon the component data, will propagate the changes caused by the disconnect. This will cause the state of the component to be stored, in that the state will be propagated throughout the system, thereby effect the remaining components.

***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER